

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawing includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet of drawing replaces the original sheet of drawing of Fig. 1. In Fig. 1, labeling of the “Return” button has been changed from “100” to “110”.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

In response to the Office Action dated January 18, 2007, claims 1, 3 and 7 have been amended. Claims 1-8 are now pending in this application. No new matter has been added.

OBJECTION TO DRAWINGS

The drawings have been objected to as the Return Button in FIG. 1 is labeled 100 while it is labeled "110" in the specification.

A substitute sheet of drawing of Fig. 1 is submitted with this response, correctly labeling the Return Button "110". Consequently, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully solicited.

OBJECTION TO SPECIFICATION

The specification has been objected to as, in many instances, "device" is misspelled as "devise".

By this response, the specification has been amended at appropriate locations to change "devise" to "device". In addition, claims 1, 3 and 7 have been amended to change "devise" to "device", and claim 7 has been further amended to provide the correct indefinite article for "conversion command" and consistency for the "external device" initially recited at line 7. Thus, amended claim 7 recites, *inter alia*:

... on receiving *a* conversion command ordering change to the first communication mode from the *external device* through the ...

These claim amendments are non-narrowing claim amendments.

Consequently, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully solicited.

OBJECTION TO CLAIMS

Claim 3 has been objected to as “second communication device” should be “first communication device”.

By this response, claim 3 has been amended as directed by the Examiner. This claim amendment is non-narrowing claim amendment.

Consequently, withdrawal of the objection to claim 3 is respectfully solicited.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara et al. (U.S. 2002/0178304) in view of Takahashi (USPN 6,867,882).

The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The difference of the present invention from Camera et al.

Camara et al. discloses controlling a mass storage device or TPT device by using the SCSI pass through protocol and a way to control the command of it. In other words, Camara et al. defines a command set (command containing FTP), which starts on a computer, based on the SCSI protocol, and also executes this command on a mass storage device (e.g. MSC apparatus).

Specifically, the protocol is defined by using a 6 byte-length Cdb known as Group 0 Cdb of Cdb (command descriptor block) including the SCSI command and parameters shown in Fig. 3 of Camara et al. Paragraph [0032] of Camara et al., in particular, discloses eight commands and each of these eight commands are described in detail.

The Examiner has indicated that, out of these 8 commands, the fourth MSC command "Read Info" corresponds to the first communication mode (TPT mode) of the present invention, and the seventh MSC command "Start Stop Capture" corresponds to the second communication mode (MS mode) of the present invention. However, communication modes and commands *are different in kind*. Therefore, switching between the fourth MSC command "Read Info" and the seventh MSC command "Start Stop Capture" is totally different from switching between MS mode and PTP mode as disclosed in the present application.

Furthermore, at least the seventh MSC command is to request a target apparatus to capture an image in accordance with the system designated by parameters. This is totally different from the MS mode. Moreover, Camara et al. does not disclose the technology of the present invention; i.e., switching the second communication mode of the image sending apparatus to the first communication mode in accordance with an instruction from the image receiving apparatus that received the transferring instruction from the image sending apparatus.

Differences Between the Present Invention and Takahashi

Takahashi discloses a data transfer system between a host and a device related to a printing method using the PTP. This is a different subject matter than automatically

switching the communication modes that is disclosed in the present application. In other words, Takahashi discloses a print system characterized in:

Selecting an image to be printed with an image inputting apparatus (digital camera) and transmitting a print execution instruction and image to be printed to an information processing apparatus (PC) via a communication device. The information processing apparatus issues a print request of the received image and transmits the image to be printed to a connected printer apparatus.

Although Takahashi does not describe a PTP mode and a MS mode, the digital camera has a print mode and this print mode corresponds to the PTP mode. However, Takahashi does not describe automatically switching the mode of the image inputting apparatus (digital camera) to print mode from the information processing side.

Neither Camara et al. nor Takashashi discloses a technology of switching the second communication mode (MS mode) of an image sending apparatus (target) to a first communication mode (PTP mode) in accordance with an instruction from an image receiving apparatus (initiator) which receives the instructions from an image sending apparatus. Consequently, the claimed invention is not obtained even if what is disclosed in Camara et al. were somehow combined with what is disclosed in Takahashi.

Thus, independent claims 1, 7 and 8 are patentable over Camara et al. and Takahashi, considered alone or in combination, as are dependent claims 2-6. Therefore, the allowance of claims 1-8, as amended, is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION


In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Edward J. Wise (Reg. No. 34,523) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Date: April 18, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Marc S. Weiner

Registration No.: 32,181

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

Attorney for Applicant